DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 288 SP 003 084

EPDA Institute in Standard English as a Second Dialect. (June 23, 1969-August 1, 1969). Director's Report.
South Florida Univ., Tampa.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Aug 69
Note-33p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.75
Descriptors-Elementary School Teachers, *English Instruction, *Institutes (Training Programs), Negro Culture, *Negro Dialects, Negro Students, Primary Grades

A 6-week institute for 38 primary school teachers (K-3), most of them from the Tampa area, was conducted to give teachers (1) a basic understanding of modern linguistics and its implications for second dialect teaching, (2) a grasp of the structural similarities and differences between Black dialects and general American English, and (3) an awareness of the Black part of America's heritage. The ratio of Black to white participants was about three to one. Three full-time staff members conducted courses in "Elements of Dialect," "Modern Grammar and Applications," "Black Culture and Folklore," and "Development of Materials." Five visiting lecturers contributed from their specialized experience in linguistics and sociology. The institute turned out a set of materials (prepared after an analysis of dialect tapes and a study of recent descriptions of several Negro dialects) that demonstrated to the participants ways in which they could apply contrastive linguistic analysis and a newly gained knowledge of Black heritage to the development of their own class materials, and guided them in the development of such materials. It is felt that the institute accomplished its goals, particularly in the area of attitude change, although the important language laboratory in the public schools was not considered successful. (One third of the report is quotations from and analysis of participant responses to an evaluation questionnaire.) (JS)

ED032288

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AUG 25 1969

Director's Report

EPDA Institute in Standard English as a Second Dialect

June 23, 1969 to August 1, 1969

Douglas K. Shaffer, Director

University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

SP003084

I. Introduction

At a time when education in the United States is moving toward de facto integration of facilities, many misunderstandings between Blacks and Whites are bound to arise. Communication among both groups is made difficult because of language and overall cultural differences between the two. Whites far too often see Blacks as being intellectually inferior because many Negroes use a language that differs somewhat from so-called Standard English. Negroes frequently regard Whites as arrogant racists who are insensitive to other cultures and who attempt to impose their particular language and culture upon all non-Anglo people. Fearing such "cultural imperialism," a large number of Negroes will tenaciously hold onto their dialect as one of the last vestiges of a culture that they can call their own. Such a view is not without foundation: whereas Whites attempt to imitate Black music for their own commercial purposes, they seldom attempt to usurp Black dialects. In the eyes of many Whites a Negro dialect is inherently Black, as much an object of derision and prejudice as the color of the Negroes' skin.

Even well-intentioned classroom teachers often try to stamp out Black dialect and replace them with Standard English. In effect they are telling their children that their language is inferior to that of middle-class Whites and are silencing them in class. The Blacks once more see a familiar cycle being repeated. The Black child in such circumstances cannot develop a healthy respect for himself, for his society, or for education. Nor, for that matter, can the White child develop a healthy respect for his Black playmates if he is unconsciously led to believe that his Black peers are "different" and inferior because of language differences. What is formally an integrated school is in reality segregated.

Even leaving aside the emotional connotations associated with this or that particular dialect, there often occur major misunderstandings between Blacks and Whites because of dialectal differences in structure, vocabulary, and pronunciation. Some Black teachers, aware of these dialectal differences but unwilling to admit them in an effort to pretend to themselves that racial problems do not exist, may be as ineffective in language teaching as many White teachers.

However, reciprocity is a very strong force in all human relations: just as hatred breeds more hatred, so do tolerance and generosity evoke more tolerance and generosity. It is in this way that the paradox above is to be resolved. As Whites come to realize that a particular dialect has nothing to do with intelligence, that no one dialect or language can be objectively shown to be better or worse than another, they begin to accept Blacks as equals in spite of their dialects. A major attitudival change takes place on the part of the Whites. As Blacks find that

Whites are now beginning to treat them as equals, they feel not so threatened by a now receding "cultural imperialism" and put up less resistance to acquiring Standard English. It is as if they were to say to themselves: "If Whites are now accepting me for what I really am -- despite my color or my language --, then it really doesn't matter whether I try to use Standard English. Since I am accepted independently of this, I will not be betraying or compromising myself even if I do use Standard English. In fact, if I do use it with Whites, I will communicate more effectively, since I will not be misunderstood."

These were the attitudival changes that we attempted to bring about with our institute. We were aiming at primary school teachers (K-3), since their children would be most flexible with regard to language modification and attitude formation. We wanted to give the teachers a basic understanding of modern linguistics and its implications for second dialect teaching, a grasp of the structural similarities and differences between Black dialects and General American English, and an awareness of the Black part of America's heritage. By giving them the first, we felt we could bring about a change in their attitudes toward language in general, something most important, since a teacher's attitudes are always sensed by her pupils. By giving them the second we attempted to give the teachers enough specific information to work with in actually teaching General American English to their children. In so doing, however, the teachers would be teaching a dialect ("Standard English") in addition to the dialects the children already used at home and elsewhere; they should not attempt to stamp out their Black dialects, which in many circumstances of daily life are more appropriate than General American English. The objective was to make them bidialectal. By giving the teachers an awareness of the Black contribution to America's heritage we wanted to instill a sense of pride on the part of the Black teachers in themselves and a sense of awareness and understanding of the Blacks on the part of the White teachers. Such increased pride and understanding will doubtlessly be imparted to the children in the classroom by our institute participants. In addition to these three academic components, involving the assimilation of new knowledge, we intended to help the participants each to develop a classroom unit which would apply the academic subject matter. Actual practice in methods and in use of these units was to take place in our language laboratories twice a week. Our institute was to accept participants from the entire nation but to place greater emphasis upon the Southeast.

II. Operation of the Program

1. Planning

In discussing implementation and modification of the planning phase of our institute, we first want to call attention to the consultants' comments on our proposal. Dr. Richard L. Light, HEW program officer working on our project, sent us a summary of these comments on January 15, 1969. His summary is reproduced below:

"The proposal was generally very well received and the program was considered a good one in a very important area. There were, however, several suggestions for modification.

"The consultants felt that in terms of materials development perhaps too much was attempted in the time available. Materials development was considered an extremely complex task and it was felt that what was outlined in the proposal would be difficult to accomplish. In this connection, it was suggested that Roger Shuy, Director of the Sociolinguistics Program at the Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C., 20036 be contacted. The Center is developing materials for teaching standard English as a second dialect and Roger Shuy has directed an institute to train teachers to work with children who speak a non-standard dialect.

"It was felt that more use should be made of existing expertise in non-standard Negro English. It was suggested, for example, that someone such as Roger Shuy or William Stewart (also at the Center for Applied Linguistics) should be considered as a lecturer in the institute, and that research findings such as those of Shuy and William Labov at Columbia University be made available in the institute. It was felt that a full-time sociolinguist should be on the institute staff; there was some question as to the part that the speech pathologist would play in the project.

"It was suggested that somewhat more attention be given to the methodology of second language/dialect teaching."

In view of these suggestions and of the $10,000 reduction in the grant originally requested several modifications were made. The services of the speech pathologist were not utilized as had been planned. Dr. Light at the TESOL meeting in Chicago in early March indicated to me, over and above the summary of the consultants' comments, that the part played by speech pathologists in second dialect teaching was found to be ineffective and even harmful to the children. There was now a lecturer vacancy as a result of the dropping of the speech pathologist. After carefully considering the availability of local faculty with training relevant to the institute and the pressing need to make this program a success -- especially since it was among the first of its kind and in a critical area --, I assumed the task of teaching a full-time load in the institute, even though it is not too common for an institute director to do so. As I will discuss later, I believe in this case such arrangements resulted in a far more effective program. It also freed more funds for other needs of the institute.

The consultants were right in judging that the materials development originally proposed was overly ambitious, although in our view major accomplishments were made even here, as will be discussed in greater detail later.

Dr. Light's references to relevant published studies on non-standard Negro English were of much use to us in several respects. They provided us with phonological and syntactic descriptions of several Black dialects and thereby were of value to us in interpreting and analyzing our dialect tapes of Black children in the Tampa area. Several of Mr. William Stewart's studies were subsequently used as reading material required of each institute participant. Some of the information contained in the works recommended were also utilized in the lectures in "Modern Grammar and Application."

Since sociolinguists are few and far between, it was not possible for us to bring one on as a full-time lecturer. In fact, Mr. Stewart was unable to appear as a guest lecturer for several days due to other commitments.

Several times very early in the planning phase I discussed by phone the aims and organization of the institute with Dr. Rudolph Troike, Associate Professor of English and Linguistics at the University of Texas at Austin. His criticism was of much value, and he was later to appear as an institute guest lecturer.

We were also to consult with several major administrators in the educational system for Hillsborough County, of which Tampa is the county seat. Even before the institute was funded they assured us of the great interest such an institute would have for the Hillsborough County Educational System, since genuine intergration of faculties and students here would begin in the fall of 1969. They offered to make whatever students and classrooms we wished available to our institute.

In this respect Mr. John C. Williams was invaluable as the Administrative Assistant of the institute. Himself a Black, he had taught for nine years in the Hillsborough County School System, his last three years in a predominantly white high school. He was thus well acquainted with the system, its needs, and its administrative personnel. Mr. Williams was to promote the institute very widely among Hillsborough County primary school teachers and to learn their own needs. On February 1, 1969 he began to work 20% of his time for the institute, contacting superintendents, principals, and classroom teachers. Mr. Williams determined a number of elementary schools in areas which he felt to be representative of major Black dialects here, contacted the school principals to obtain permission to visit the schools with the option of taping individual children in this or that class during a later visit,

then returned actually to observe the dialects used in class, and finally came back again to record some of the children. The taping period ran from about mid-March to early May. Mr. Williams was also to go through various official channels to secure classrooms and groups of Black children for the language laboratory during the institute. I have deliberately used the phrase "to go through various official channels," since -- even though some of the leading Hillsborough County education officials had promised us their fullest cooperation at the outset -- they were soon to refer us to their subordinates who in turn referred us to other subordinates. All this cost us much valuable time at critical periods. In reality the attitude of the main county school officials toward the institute could most accurately be described as neutral: if we were willing to spend the time and effort tracking down the person who was really in charge of this or that operation, then we could obtain what we asked for. Needless to say, Mr. Williams of his own free will was actually to work far beyond the 20% budgeted him without additional compensation. At the same time, I believe this points up the faith of a Black educator in the kinds of changes that our institute was designed to bring about.

We had originally conceived our institute as serving primarily the southeast with a fair representation by observers from major urban centers across the country. In the case of those participants from outside the southeast we felt that it would be most effective to select someone who seemed well qualified to observe what was going on in our institute so that she could return to her community and inform other teachers there. But such an approach obviously could not be intensive, as few participants would be as effective in mastering and transmitting the information as the institute staff and since there would only be one out of any particular city who would have attended our institute. In the case of the southeastern United States we had to consider whether or not to take the same approach there that we were taking with major urban areas outside the southeast. Since our tapes were made of necessity in Hillsborough County and since we had been promised the complete cooperation of the Hillsborough County Public School System, we began to consider the pros and cons of limiting the southeastern participants largely to the Tampa area. There were two final arguments that convinced us to do this: Mr. Williams would be in an excellent position to determine, together with those Black members of the selection committee from the county school system, which applicants were likely to be the most promising participants; and such an arrangement would make it possible to undertake a concentrated effort to implement major educational changes in the integrated schools of one particular city. This was the plan that we finally agreed upon. In order to insure the greater likelihood of classroom impact we largely selected groups of several participants from the same schools. Thus they would be able to reinforce each other's work in the classroom and to run more effective training programs for the other teachers at their schools.

2. Participants

Our institute was designed to service 35 participants. The number originally proposed was 40, but with the reduction in funds allocated, 35 was suggested to us as the target. Due to several factors which allowed us internal economies we asked Mrs. Carol Epstein if we could admit the original number of 40, since this was possible even within our new budget. If a bit of boasting is allowed, we take pride in having been able to accommodate our original number on our new budget.

We wanted a ratio of Black to White participants of about 3:1. Although nowhere on the application forms is race indicated (and some provisions should be made for this or for ethnic background in the case of institutes catering to particular minority groups), this ratio was achieved. In the case of applicants from Hillsborough County it was easy for the Black members of the selection committee to tell which applicants were most likely Black from school and address if they did not actually know the applicants personally. In the case of applicants from out of state the point of reference used in their letters requesting application forms together -- in some cases -- with the colleges attended generally told us whether they were Black or White.

We wanted participants who were young enough to acquire new information and who would be able to utilize this newly won knowledge in the classroom for a number of years. We also wanted participants who were interested enough in education to return regularly to college every two or three years; this showed up in their education background on the application form.

On the whole about 25% of the participants were excellent classroom teachers and scholars as well. This percentage was highly motivated, enthusiastic, and likely to work effectively with their children and colleagues to bring about major changes in their schools. Most of these people were already known to the Black members of the selection committee as excellent teachers and were readily selected as participants. Our only regret was that this percentage was not higher, although 25% is probably a very satisfactory figure for most institutes.

Unhappily about the same percentage -- 25% -- obtained among those participants who were neither effective teachers nor promising scholars. This group, which comprised both Blacks and Whites like the first, contained teachers who were unwilling to do the assigned (and most necessary) readings, turn in class assignments (and these were limited in number), and do much in the way of materials development.

About 50% of the participants fell somewhere between the two extremes: average teachers with average motivation and average scholastic abilities.

Modifications in the selection procedure which this experience suggests would entail a transcript of college-level work as a part of the participants'application. This should make it possible to eliminate the group of participants without any motivation or scholastic interest and would perhaps even reduce the percentage of average teachers.

Interestingly enough, among the top 25% were several teachers who had recently graduated to administrative ranks. They had risen on the basis of their own accomplishments in the classroom but had not yet been out of the classroom long enough to lose their teaching effectiveness, awareness of classroom needs, or a willingness to return to college for periodic retraining in subject matter new to them.

Equally interesting was the fact that our best and worst participants were drawn from Hillsborough County. Most of the participants from out of town fell somewhere in the 50% "average" group. While this is too small a sample to draw any hard and fast conclusions from, it may be that the least motivated teachers in any area would not want to go to the trouble of moving to a summer institute very far away. And, as mentioned before, our Black members of the institute selection committee were local educators who already knew the most promising participants very well.

Two participants were forced to drop out of the institute after the first three weeks. Mrs. Evelyn C. Broudy withdrew because of personal reasons. Mrs. LuBertha R. Hardge was required to go into the hospital for treatment of hypertension and high blood pressure and thus was unable to complete her participation in the institute.

Twenty-seven of the 40 participants were drawn from Tampa; 3 from areas of Hillsborough County outside of Tampa; 4 from Florida Cities and towns outside of Hillsborough County; and 6 from out of state. Those 4 Florida communities represented were Dade City, Immokalee, St. Augustine, and St. Petersburg. The out-of-state communities represented were Hamden, Connecticut; Chicago; St. Louis; Oxon Hill, Maryland; Charleston, South Carolina; and Chinle, Arizona. The participants from Oxon Hill and Chinle were alternates chosen as participants after the non-acceptance or withdrawal from institute participation. Those chosen as participants but who did not attend the institute lived in Milwaukee; Marina del Rey, California; Brooklyn; Mesa, Arizona; and Tampa. In several instances withdrawal due to family illness shortly before the institute began resulted in our awarding institute fellowships to alternates from Tampa, as they could be notified and their acceptances received in less time than in the case of those alternates from out of state. Thus, whereas eight participants from outside Florida were originally chosen to attend, only six non-Florida communities were represented when our institute began.

3. Staff

It goes without saying, of course that the training and background of the staff are vital to the success of any institute. There was still another important factor in the case of our institute, which was directed at teachers of Black youngsters: participation by a competent young Black educator who had genuine powers. He had to be young enough to identify with the teachers and children and to have an accurate understanding of their situation in America of 1969. He had to be an experienced educator; otherwise, his age alone would not have given him true insight into the classroom situation for Blacks. Given this competence and experience, he had to be accorded a number of real powers, lest our institute bear the marks of one planned largely for Blacks by Whites with only a partial understanding of the Negroes. In working on our institute from the planning stage on, I became keenly aware of one important fact: there are numerous cultural differences between Blacks and Whites in America even today. This point, in fact, was well stated by one of our guest lecturers, Reverend Rogers P. Fair, who remarked that there have developed in America since her founding two different societies -- Black and White -- separately and along different lines. These cultural differences were taken into account in planning and operating our institute largely because of Mr. Williams' advice and interpretations. He was in a position to bridge the gap between both cultures because almost half of his education -- including part of his college work -- had been in predominantly White institutions, and he understood White society well.

Mr. Williams was invaluable not only in the planning and operational aspects of our institute but also in the course work offered. His college training had been in American history and sociology, and his own interests had led him to read widely in the history and social institutions of the American Negro. He was in an excellent position to teach the component dealing with Black culture and folklore. Since he was a Black, his presentation was received with more attention than would have been the case had he been White and was felt to be most relevant.

The value of Mr. Williams' role in our institute may also be seen from the fact that two of our guest lecturers were so impressed by him that they initiated arrangements for him to begin work on his doctorate at the University of Texas at Austin in the fall of 1970.

One change in staff has already been mentioned concerning the role of a speech pathologist. Another occurred when Mr. Robert O'Hara was unable to teach this summer. He had originally been scheduled to teach "Modern Grammar and Application," but his accumulated vacation leave fell at such a time that he had either to take it this summer or to give it up altogether.

The staff as originally proposed had been as follows:

(1) Dr. Douglas K. Shaffer (institute director without teaching duties);

(2) Dr. Clarence E. Webb (Materials research and the courses "Elements of Dialect"and "Development of Materials");

(3) Mr. Robert C. O'Hara (materials research and the courses "Modern Grammar and Application" and "Development of Materials");

(4) Dr. William Garrett (materials research and the courses "Development of Materials" and "Instructional Films");

(5) Mr. John C. Williams (materials research and the courses "Black Culture and Folklore" and "Development of Materials").

With Dr. Webb and Mr. O'Hara not participating in the program, the staff was then composed of Dr. Garrett, Mr. Williams, and me.

The planning stage of our grant was only able to support work by Mr. Williams and me, and Dr. Garrett's work with the Institute officially did not begin until June. The reassignment of courses was as follows:

(1) Dr. Garrett (the course "Elements of Dialect")

(2) Dr. Shaffer (the courses "Modern Grammar and Application" and "Development of Materials")

(3) Mr. Williams (the courses "Black Culture and Folklore" and "Development of Materials")

Since Mr. Williams and I had worked with the dialect tape research and the pilot development of materials during the planning stage we likewise teamtaught the course "Development of Materials."

Due to the small staff there was no difficulty in maintaining staff involvement throughout the summer institute. Because we had worked together from the planning stage on and felt most responsible as the Administrative Assistant and the Director, respectively, Mr. Williams and I were most directly involved in the institute at all times.

It now seems that it would have been more effective if we had included on our staff a fourth person, someone with extensive

experience as a teacher in a primary classroom. She would have been invaluable in the course "Development of Materials" and in implementing the language laboratory. Perhaps this was partly what your consultants had in mind when "(i)t was suggested that somewhat more attention be given to the methodology of second language/dialect teaching -"

Our visiting lecturers were well received, and their messages fitted well into the overall framework of the institute. The visiting lecturers were as follows:

(1) Dr. Rudolph C. Troike (The University of Texas at Austin, Department of English and Linguistics);

(2) Reverend Rogers P. Fair (Bethune-Cookman College, Department of Sociology);

(3) Mr. Riley B. Smith (Texas A & M University, Department of English);

(4) Dr. Roger Abrahams (The University of Texas at Austin, Department of English);

(5) Dr. Charles Parrish (The University of Louisville, Department of Sociology).

Professor Troike's remarks were directed at recent linguistic research in Texas and elsewhere which suggests that every human with language possesses a receptive command of several dialects and an active command of one and directed at some of the implications of this research for bidialectalism. Also he later gave a one hour sketch of the basic dialect areas of the United States and the history of their development. Both talks, most participants states, were of much use to them in putting into better perspective information gained in their linguistics courses.

Reverend Fair, a Black Methodist minister and sociologist, spoke of the separate development of a Black and of a White Society in America, of some of the attitudes that must be assumed by members of each society in attempting to get on with members of the other, and the role that language plays within a society. Because of his message and means of delivery Reverend Fair was a most relevant speaker.

Mr. Smith spoke of some of the phonological and syntactic features of Black dialects in East Texas, which he has researched in working on the Texas Dialect Atlas. His ability to handle these dialects and his remarks on teaching standard English as a second dialect enabled him to establish an immediate rapport with his audience.

Dr. Troike had strongly recommended that Dr. Abrahams be brought out as an additional lecturer. Professor Abrahams, though White, is one of the nation's limited number of experts on Black folklore. He spoke on the origins of White attitudes toward Blacks and on the development of the Black revolution after World War II. By deliberately taking a controversial stand on several issues, he among all our visiting lecturers was able to elicit a reaction from almost all the participants and to bring about a very frank and honest discussion of some of his points. Dr. Abrahams made his subject matter most real and relevant to the participants.

Professor Parrish spoke on some of correlations between literacy and a command of Standard English, on the one hand, and employment and social mobility, on the other, drawing largely upon the situation in Louisville.

This group of speakers was invaluable in adding to the expertise of our institute's small staff.

4. Program Operation

In meeting the program objectives originally set we successfully --

-- Made the participants aware of some of the major differences between General American English and some Black dialects and of some of their deeper underlying similarities;

-- Showed the participants how a linguistic view of dialects and languages, by eliminating prejudice against any particular language form as being "inferior," could modify their own attitudes toward Black dialects and make it possible for them to teach Standard English more effectively as a second dialect on a contrastive basis;

-- Developed among our participants the ability to listen more attentively to the language patterns used by their children in the classrooms;

-- Turned out a set of materials (prepared after an analysis of our dialect tapes and a study of recent descriptions of several Negro dialects) that demonstrated to the participants ways in which they could apply contrastive linguistic analysis and a newly gained knowledge of Black heritage to the development of their own class materials;

-- Instructed our participants in the period of the slave trade and of slavery and showed them the effects of both upon the development of separate and unequal societies;

-- Made the participants more aware of the basic differences between the Black family and the White family as social institutions and traced the causes of such differences;

-- Introduced the participants to some classical and recent scholarly literature in the fields of the history and sociology of Black Americans;

-- Guided the participants in the development of their own materials for them to take back to their own classrooms.

But there were some things which we were not so successful at: by and large the language laboratory was a failure, and it had a kind of "negative spinoff." There were a number of reasons why this part of our institute did not come off as planned. For one thing, when we began to go through the various channels to set up our lab in conjunction with the Hillsborough County schools, we had not yet thought through the entire concept of the language laboratory. We knew, of course, that it was vital for teachers to see how instructional materials such as ours would actually work out in a classroom. But we were still vague in our thinking about whether each participant would teach a lab, work in a group team-teaching, or merely observe the best teachers work with a demonstration class or perhaps some combination. The exact number of children we would need for the lab would vary according to the kind of lab we wanted. As a demonstration class conducted by one or several demonstration teachers, a very small lab would have been most satisfactory for all the participants to observe. In our budget we had requested funds to provide lunch for and to transport to and from the University of South Florida campus a class of 30 children all during the institute. But, as I said, we had not yet given thorough consideration to all the aspects of the lab mentioned above when we formally made our request to use children from the Hillsborough County summer school program. It was pointed out to us that, even though we could take the children out to our campus for one or two field trips, the Hillsborough County school system would prefer that the classes using their children be held in their own schools. Such a position was reasonable enough, of course, but it was to have detrimental effects on the lab which none of us could foresee. We were then referred to Mrs. Marcia Paulson, the person in charge of all reading programs in the Hillsborough County public schools. While the status of summer Headstart programs here was uncertain, it was known that the county would definitely operate once again a summer reading program and that there would be a large percentage of Black children attending. But the exact number of children attending would not be known until the date of enrollment, about June 18.

Mrs. Paulson was to cooperate with us to the best of her ability, but, as will be seen later, there were several complicating factors beyond the control of either the Hillsborough County staff or our own institute staff. Even though the numbers of pupils to be enrolled and available to our institute would not become available until mid June, Mrs. Paulson indicated a ceiling on the numbers of children placed in any one classroom; each class in the reading program would be small. Since we accepted that our classes would be held in county schools and now that the regular classes at each school would be small, we went ahead and decided to send small groups - about 5 or 6 - of participants to teach at each of several schools we requested which were in largely Black neighborhoods. This would mean, of course, that Mr. Williams and I could not be on the spot to observe and take part in each school lab at all times. On the other hand, this arrangement would make it possible for each teacher to take a more active part in the lab. We finally settled upon six particular schools, and Mrs. Paulson contacted the teachers there responsible to her to notify them that we had been granted permission to run our labs in their schools twice a week from 10:30 to 11:30 a.m. This schedule she had suggested, since the first reading programs were to start at 8:30 and to run for two hours. The children could then stay on for an hour-long lab and then for lunch from 11:30 to 12:00 Noon.

But there were also problems with the lunches. Despite the fact that the educators here admitted that many Black children go to school on empty stomachs, the school lunch subsidy program does not run in the summer, so the school cafeterias would be closed then. Could we cater food in then? It would probably be better to have it catered to the campus and then ask each group of teachers to carry the lunches out to their own schools, as the food catering service could then make one delivery rather than six. The children, of course, would be allowed to eat these lunches right in their own classrooms under the watchful eyes of our participants. The University of South Florida, however, has granted exclusive food catering rights to Morrison's Cafeteria. The lunch Morrison's offered to cater was a standard adult one - much too large for small children and much too expensive ($1.40 each). And by then we had about 125 children enrolled in our labs, but that is getting ahead of the story. The solution we finally hit upon was to furnish the children each with two pieces of fried chicken and milk (Maryland Fried Chicken gave us the best rates and would supply us the milk at cost, 9¢ a carton) and to circumvent the exclusive franchise to Morrison's by asking our groups of teachers once off the campus to stop by the fried chicken retail outlet to pick up the lunches before going on to their schools. The last time this happened one of the six orders of chicken was placed by mistake with one of the other five. After the teachers had left, the error was discovered. But every dark cloud has a silver lining: when the group arrived at their school

and discovered milk but no chicken in their box, there was no alarm, since there were no children to teach. Without notifying our participants the day before when they held their lab, the teachers had taken all the children on a field trip.

We had originally scheduled the lab to run for six weeks, the entire duration of the institute. We learned in early June, however, that the county schools let out the entire week for July 4. Since continuity would have been broken and since the first week our participants would not really be able to do much in the labs themselves, we began lab operations the second week of July. This left us with only four weeks of lab. Shortly before we got into the classrooms Mrs. Paulson came out and spoke to our participants about their reading programs and also mentioned that in some of the schools where we would be holding our labs the times for operating them had changed. So the next day some of our groups left to appear at 10:00, others to appear at 10:15, still others to appear at 10:30. We were allowing our participants thirty minutes to travel to their schools and thirty more to return to the campus. The entire institute class schedule was interrupted as some participants left in the middle of class. Continuing the next day with the new lab schedule given us, the institute course work with the exception of the very first hour's lecture was also interrupted. After lunch we learned that, while at several schools things had gone like clockwork, at two the individual school teachers had held their classes longer than they should have have, according to their new schedules presented us two days before. This was unknown to Mrs. Paulson, and after we contacted her to explain our difficulties, she saw to it that not only did the teachers not run beyond the time allowed them by the central reading program staff, but that henceforth the original schedule would be observed by <u>all</u> the schools where we had labs. In these two schools where several individual teachers apparently did not welcome our laboratory, our participants subsequently found that some days the teachers would flood them with pupils and that on other days only a trickle would be turned over to them.

The first lab day our teachers merely got acquainted with the children, got to know the teachers and the surroundings. The second lab day we had expected to receive an accurate count of the number of pupils taking part in our program. For the two schools mentioned above it was impossible to ascertain accurately. Since we needed the permission of the parents to allow their children to participate in our project, the participants were given slips to be returned. The signed slips were also important as indicators of the number of lunches to be provided the children. Whereas about two or three of our groups were extremely well organized even under difficult circumstances, several others were not and were late in carrying out the slips to be signed and returned. The same was true in the case of the permission slips to be signed by the parents to let their children go on a field trip to the university.

We had had time to identify the better teachers and tried to place one such teacher as a group leader for each school. Yet at the same time we tried to allow local teachers who happened to be from one of the six schools to go back there with the lab, thereby allowing for smoother operations. (The two schools where we had the most difficulty were those which had no teachers represented in our institute.)

Thus out of a four-week lab period the first week was at best one of getting to know the children, and the last, likewise being the last week of the reading program, was reserved for a field trip to the campus. Only two weeks, that is four days, were really available for uninterrupted laboratories in most of the schools. The field trip, I should add, was attended by 75 children (for various reasons about 50 had failed to bring back their permission slips in time), and they all enjoyed it immensely. It was the first time any of them had ever been on the campus. The program began with a talk by a telephone linesman graciously provided by the General Telephone Company of Florida, an opportunity for the children to use Teletrainers (again furnished by General Telephone). lunch in the main (Morrison) campus cafeteria, a Walt Disney Cartoon in Spanish, "Ferdinand the Bull," shown on television receivers in the language laboratory, and two color cartoons in one of the auditoriums. The last day demonstrates how orderly a demonstration class could and should have been held had it been conducted on campus.

Because of the different situations at each school some of the groups (the better ones) organized among themselves and team-taught the entire class, while other groups split up with individual groups.

The possibilities of a well organized and well staffed lab are illustrated by a typical session of the best of the six groups. The participants in this group had decided very early that they would team-teach and would develop their own materials so that they would dovetail with the materials developed by other members of the group. Also an important factor is that three of the participants in this group fell in the upper 25% of our institute. The very first day of lab the group asked that their classes be put together in a class of about 20 or 25 in the school library. The permission slips now signed were turned back the very next day. The lab session described below occurred in the last lab before the campus field trip.

A triumvirate of two Blacks and one White acted as group leaders, taking turns making announcements, interjecting comments, asking questions. They really acted as a moderator

for another teacher who was to test out her previously prepared lesson plan on the class. First the triumvirate greeted the children, asked them a few things, and got the children to sing a few songs to get the class into the spirit of participating. Then a White teacher announced that she was going to read a story about a Negro girl from the city who goes to visit her grandmother in the country. She and the triumvirate first asked the children review questions about families - a subject they had discussed before (they were implementing what they had learned about the Black family in "Black Culture and Folklore"): "How many kinds of families are there?" - "Two." - "What kind are they?" - "Black families and White families." - "Very good. Now, who can tell me who all there are in a family?" - "Father--" (After the various answers) - "Who can tell in a complete sentence?" - "There are Father, Mother, Sister, and Brother." - "And sometimes there is Grandmother. Not everybody lives with Father or Mother. Some children live with their Grandmother. Now, today's story is about a little girl who goes to visit her grandmother in the country...."

The story tells how the little girl suddenly gets thirsty and finds there is no faucet in the kitchen. She goes out into the yard and sees a well with a bucket suspended by a rope and pulls up her drink of water. "In the country you have to learn to do things for yourself," the story says, teaching a spirit of independence and self-reliance. Next she finds she is hungry and discovers that there is no icebox with food in the kitchen. She goes out into the yard again, sees some greens, takes them into the house, and puts them in grandmother's pot on the stove to cook. "In the country you have to learn to do things for yourself." She wants dessert after a meal of greens but finds none in the house. She goes outside, discovers a watermelon, takes it in the house, and shares it with grandmother. "In the country you have to learn to do things for yourself."

Then the teacher asked the class questions about the story. When a child mispronounced a word, one of the teachers would gently correct him. In reply to the question about what the little girl looked for in the kitchen when she was thirsty, a number of hands shot up and the answer "a faucet" rang out in several quarters. Someone said "a tap." One of the triumvirate noticed this and called it to the class's attention. "See, we sometimes call it a tap. What else do we sometimes call a faucet or a tap?" - "A spigot." - "That's right. We sometimes call it a spigot. We can call it a faucet, a tap, or a spigot." And the rest of the questions on the story continued. The teacher who dwelled on the tap was implementing something she had learned several weeks before. When Professor Troike had pointed out that there are numerous regional differences in vocabulary items, this teacher commented that in response to a standard vocabulary test a pupil of hers had referred to a

"skillet" as a "spider". Not knowing the term "spider" for a pan, she told the child he was wrong. After Professor Troike's talk she was sorry she had handled the answer in such a way and wondered if she had done much real damage. The lab incident demonstrated her ability to assimilate new knowledge and to apply it instantaneously in the classroom.

After the story had been discussed, the teacher who had read it remarked that since there were neither TV nor movies in the country, children have to learn to make up some of their own games. Some of the other teachers asked what kinds of games they knew. When one child answered "Loop the Loop," the teacher pulled out a record of that song-game combination as sung by a group of Black children in Alabama and played it for the group. She replayed it while one of the Black teachers brought up a group to sing and dance to the music with her. Then it was time for the chicken lunch. It was all so well organized, so well thought out, so attuned to the cultural heritage of the children. It was a beautiful close to a lab that had begun so inauspiciously.

We originally had had high expectations of our lab component. In late May we had visited the Shadeville Public Schools, twenty miles south of Tallahassee, where we had viewed in operation a highly successful program for teaching Negro children standard English within a regular primary school curriculum. Their program, entailing the recording of dialect tapes, the production of language materials, and the training of teachers, demonstrates what several competent, highly motivated, and well informed teachers can accomplish. The Shadeville classes had shown us in operation short English classes with dialogs and pattern drills utilized most effectively. The only criticism that in our view could be made of their program is that it contains no Black heritage component. Nevertheless, the Shadeville program impressed us as a most vital and effective approach to teaching Black youngsters General American English. Having seen this kind of class operation, we recognized the potential of a language laboratory.

If somehow we were able to replace this institute, we now think we would run one demonstration class on campus with a small group of children for several days a week during the entire institute. The inclusion of an experienced primary school classroom teacher as a full-time staff member would provide us with our major demonstration teacher. It would also be possible for some of these lab sessions to be taught by individual participants teaching under the general direction of this staff member. In this way the entire institute would be able to observe demonstration classes as taught by superior teachers and to discuss the classroom teaching performance of each participant in the lab. What I think most important in this respect would be the demonstration aspects of a handful of superior teachers as a

model rather than the kind of lab we had where in most groups each teacher "did her own thing." Even though a demonstration class on the campus would be somewhat idealized, it still would serve as a guide to excellent teaching.

There remained the question of classroom instruction in Black dialects as such. In the Shadeville program the children were told that the way they already spoke was fine for all purposes outside of school but that what they would learn in school for use there would be "school language." We really had to feel our way along on this one. Despite the fact that we were able to discuss phonological and grammatical features of Black dialects very openly from near the beginning of our institute, there remains a probable reluctance on the part of Black teachers deliberately to teach Black dialects as such through language patterns. In fact, many Negro teachers, they admitted, had modified their original Black speech so much through the years that it would be hard for them to teach a productive command of it to their children. What finally struck us as being most appropriate was to include in the curricular various poems and songs in Negro dialects. This would quite honestly accord recognition to these dialects, but in the case of prose the children would be guided along the lines of "Standard English." This would constantly be modeled by the teachers. Where the poems and songs in Black dialects were beyond the White teachers and many of the Black teachers, records would suffice as a model for the children.

We were able to provide our participants with relevant literature on Black heritage through the good offices of the library of Bethune-Cookman College in Daytona Beach. Mr. Williams spent several days there going through their holdings and selecting standard books to borrow for our institute. This collection was housed in the reserve reading room of the University of South Florida library. With funds budgeted for the purpose we bought a number of other basic books for use by our participants. They were housed in the institute office, and Mrs. Hutto, our secretary, acted as librarian, keeping track of these titles. However, even though the office was in the same building as the institute classes, it was far too small to serve as a reading room. The classroom space allotted us by the university space planning office was more than adequate for our needs, but we were unable to secure in the same building a room suitable as a reading room. Had we been able to obtain such a reading room in the building where our classes were held we could have encouraged more of the relevant literature by making it immediately accessible and perhaps by scheduling within our daily program an hour for study of the literature.

There was one problem connected with receipt of our textbooks. Although we had turned in all our orders very early in the year, the university bookstore was unable to locate our book shipments

in time. This was due to the fact that the bookstore personnel who had throughout the planning stage given us their utmost cooperation went on summer vacations at about the time that our institute began. The bookstore was then understaffed for several weeks and unable to maintain normal operations. While this delay did not really affect the linguistic classes - the linguistic texts were located within several days --, the course "Black Culture and Folklore" was greatly affected, since it was upwards of two weeks before the text for that course became available. As a result, Mr. Williams was not able to cover as much material in his course as he had planned. Nevertheless, he was able to dwell at length upon slavery and upon the sociology of the Black family. Our White participants thereby gained insight into the major reasons for differences between Black and White ~~moves~~ mores, educational backgrounds, and personal and group goals; and the degree of prejudice that they no doubt had originally brought with them was lessened. By the same token our Black participants thereby gained a deeper understanding of their own development, a clearer idea of the goals they are striving for, and in most instances a greater respect for themselves and their own people.

Mr. Williams and several of the Black participants suggested at various times that songs and chants would be very effective means of teaching pattern drills and material for memorization to Negro youngsters. This is an example of cultural differences in teaching devices and one which no doubt would have gone unnoticed by an all White staff.

The beginning and ending dates of our institute were most satisfactory (June 23 - August 1). Opinion as to the duration of the program was divided: while it is true that an eight-week institute would have given us two more crucial weeks, better organization would perhaps make six weeks sufficient. Still there should be considered the longer amount of time for new knowledge to "sink in" that would be provided by an eight-week program.

A copy of the staff materials and participants' materials are being sent to you under separate cover. In this connection several comments by your consultants were most prophetic:

> "The consultants felt that in terms of materials development perhaps too much was attempted in the time available. Materials development was considered an extremely complex task and it was felt that what was outlined in the proposal would be difficult to accomplish..... It was suggested that somewhat more attention be given to the methodology of second language/dialect teaching."

By the time we had completed a preliminary survey of phonological and grammatical patterns of our tapes, it was already mid-June. Since some materials were essential as models for our participants to follow in developing their own lessons, we turned out eight model lessons that stressed pattern drills and various kinds of substitution and guided production exercises for this purpose. As you will see from these materials sent you separately, what were stressed therein were major uses of BE (past and present) in Standard English, the existential THERE BE construction, several question forms, limited work on negation, and subject-verb agreement. With more time we would have included a number of additional phonotactic and syntactic patterns. You will also note at this point that although four Brer Rabbit tales in simplified Standard English were appended as culturally-based stories, there was no real integration of content and linguistic forms in the initial materials. Several of the most promising teachers during the institute were to suggest several kinds of games and exercises that would combine both cultural content and linguistic form most imagivatively. One participant suggested the game "Who am I?" to follow a unit in which various forms of BE had been drilled and in which the lives of numerous famous Black Americans had been presented in story form. In this game the teacher would give the children several clues as to the identity of a famous Black and ask the children to guess the personage. Some forms commonly used might be the question by a child: "Are you...?" to which the teacher would reply in the first person: "Yes, I am ...." or "No, I'm not ..." After a child guessed the personality correctly, he could then select a famous Black American and give the rest of the class clues. At this point the teacher could moderate between the child at the head of the class and the children guessing by rephrasing questions and answers in the third person: "Are you...?" -- "No, I'm not ..." -- "No, he isn't..." This is a most useful kind of exercise presented in game form.

As can be seen in several of the participants' lessons, some of them were prepared quite skillfully and imaginatively. It was when such ideas were suggested or when we witnessed really fine lab sessions that we began to realize the need for an additional staff member who was an experienced classroom teacher. In a sense, too, it developed that a dialog was established between the staff and the participants, as we were presenting the lessons we had prepared as models, pointing out weaknesses and strengths in them, and quite honestly calling for any additional ideas from the participants in better implementation. As mentioned above, some of our participants were to suggest exactly what we called for.

A well run demonstration class would no doubt have brought forth better implementation of these methods and activities for all the participants to see and as such might well have given other participants new ideas for materials development. It would also have made the goals of materials development far clearer to the participants from the very outset.

As can be seen from the participants' materials, our participants developed enough to last each one more than a year in the classroom. True, there are wide variations in the linguistic and cultural quality of these materials, but each teacher can modify any of the lessons as she so pleases, and many of the better units may spark each teacher to develop additional lessons for use by her own class.

Useful as they are in their present form, these lessons need to have additional language patterns inserted on a graded basis and to have the stories, games, and dialogs rearranged according to subject matter. Those of our staff who worked most closely with materials development would now be in a far better position than before to utilize our knowledge and experience gained in the planning and operational phases of our institute in developing and also directing the development of subsequent materials.

Many a time the lecture in "Black Culture and Folklore" was to give rise to a frank and open discussion between Blacks and Whites and among the Blacks themselves. At the close of the institute, however, several Black participants told us that, had there been an approximately equal distribution of Blacks and Whites, they would have spoken even more candidly. Feeling that they outnumbered the Whites by too large a margin, they held their tongues on some points, feeling criticism of Whites in general would have been unfair to the White minority in our institute.

Except for the difficulties associated with our language lab the distribution of staff and participant time for both formal instruction and unstructured activities was largely satisfactory. Since some discussions triggered in "Black Culture and Folklore" demanded more time for a free discussion of major issues, the two linguistic classes occasionally had to be cut short. A candid airing of views between the two races is essential, and perhaps a better schedule would have allowed 30 additional minutes or so for each class in Black culture. This suggestion appears even more reasonable when it is taken into account that two hours a day were set aside for linguistic instruction as opposed to only one a day for Black culture.

If our view that much of the Whites' prejudice against Black arises from the tendency of the former to associate intelligence directly with a command of Standard English (the "Pygmalion

Effect," whereby Whites assume the more nearly perfect a persons" command of the standard language, the more intelligent he is) and that much of the Blacks' imperfect command of Standard English is directly attributable to their resistance to complete subservience to White standards, since they resent continued White arrogance toward them is correct, then the substantive content of our program was directly related to the classroom situation. By learning about the nature of language and about the development of Black society in the United States, our White participants left our institute with less prejudice and more compassion toward the Blacks as human beings. By learning about the nature of language and about the development of Black society in the United States, our Black participants left our institute with a greater self-understanding and self-respect. Both groups also acquired essential knowledge and efficient techniques for teaching Standard English as a common means of effective communication for all Americans regardless of color. Yet both groups left far more tolerant of their children's present speech patterns. With such a background both groups were to teach, study, and develop materials together, a common friendship, trust, and respect having begun to grow out of this common effort. Our only criticism with respect to the relationship between substantive content and classroom application is that the content still outstripped application to some extent.

5. Evaluation

Staff reports directed at an outside funding agency such as the Office of Education should, of course, be viewed with caution; an institute director naturally wants to think of and present his institute as having been a great success. And when has any such institute been reported by its staff as a failure? And, even when the honesty and intentions of an institute's staff are taken at face value, still the staff may delude itself into genuinely believing that their project was far better than was actually the case. Some sort of evaluation by persons other than the staff is necessary to balance out staff views.

The evaluation we wanted was provided by the institute participants. The very last day of our institute we passed out a survey containing ten questions with spaces for answers. We explained that since we wanted a candid evaluation, we wanted the participants to print their answers and to place the unsigned papers on an unmonitored table at the front of the room when they had completed the survey. We believe that the answers we received were an accurate reflection of the participants' views of our institute.

Since two people had withdrawn from our program three weeks previously and since one participant was absent the last day, we collected 37 completed surveys.

The following are the results of the answers to the questions: "What parts of the institute did you like best?" (Some participants listed several elements here.):

10 liked all parts equally well;
10 liked "Black Culture and Folklore" best;
10 liked "Elements of Dialect" best;
10 liked "Modern Grammar and Application" best;
6 liked the visiting lecturers best;
4 liked the "Development of Materials" best;
3 liked the lab best.

Some of the specific answers to this question were as follows:

"Black history - because I like history if it is related to today's behavior and this is in my opinion. Developing lesson plans was practical."

"I gained a better insight of sentence structure in the English of some Negro dialects as compared with Media English."

"Using materials developed by staff and thoes (sic) I developed with the children in the lab. Because I am thoroughly interest(sic) in the dialect and see a real need to have child (sic) include standard English in their communication system."

"I like the Black Negro History part because it help (sic) me to find my identity."

"I liked the visiting lecturers and the lab best. The lecturers seemed to make much clearer some of the things that were trying to be taught in class. I liked the lab because I enjoy teaching."

"I liked the speakers - they add interest and inject new ideas from other areas."

"I liked all of the institute - each part had a direct connection with the other. It was very informative but time was our greatest enemy."

"Historical background of Negro history and the awareness of Negro Dialect."

"I liked the modern grammar and linguistic (sic) as a background, because I feel like it better prepared me to work with boys and girls for the years to come. Of course, I wish the course could have been longer, because I was crammed in <u>really four weeks</u> with a year's worth of work."

"Black Culture - Because this course was informative as to how this system works. And stirred the feelings of the participants, maybe to the point of attacking the problem."

"The institution as a whole was a good one. I say this because their (sic) were many things brought out and taught that should be made aware to all people. Such as: the many contributions by the Blacks, the dialects that are spoken by the Blacks and the ways and means to get Blacks to comform (sic) to Media English."

"The linguistic part of the Institution, because to me it was something I really needed to know about the language of Black dialect or non-English speakers compared to Media English."

"Guest speakers and formulation of materials. Because this is concrete material that I can add to or delete from and use in my classroom."

"The Folklore class had a shade of an edge over the other two classes because it as (sic) brought to my attention how much I don't know and through disagreements with things that were said in the class, motivated me to read for truth."

In response to the question: "What parts of the institute program did you like least and why?" we received the following answers (in some cases several elements were disliked by each participant):

12 disliked the language laboratory, citing loss of time traveling to and from the schools, sometimes finding no children to teach, and the limited amount of time spent actually working with the children;

4 did not dislike any part of the institute;

3 disliked"Black Culture and Folklore";

3 disliked that part of "Modern Grammar and Application" devoted to the deep structure of sentences (trees);

2 disliked "Modern Grammar and Application" altogether;

2 disliked both linguistics courses;

2 disliked having to take tests;

2 disliked the level of organizational efficiency of the institute;

2 disliked the manner of presentation.

Some of these comments were as follows:

"The English courses - A language, disected scientifically, may have been necessary for this particular learning, but it just doesn't interest me. Nor do I have the academic background to 'dig'."

"I did not like the laboratory. Going out to the different schools was not valuable at all. I never had a set group of kids to work with. It was a waste of time, money, and energy. The teachers at the school which I visited seemed unaware of what was going on and made no big effort to supply children. etc. not enough space (to fill in the reply)!"

"Development of materials period too short. Loss of time traveling to lab centers."

"Linguistics - I didn't understand it, and I didn't have the background because of my major Elem. Education. It was above my level, also my children who are 1st graders."

"The test. I have been in several institutes - No test. Projects? Yes! But No test!"

"Going into the school to teach children and some time (sic) didn't find any children to teach."

"The lab was the least I like, becaused (sic) we didn't have enough time to really do our thing or develop our materials."

"The Lab experience was inadequate, confused and frustrating."

"The classroom work and written assignments. This was a little too deep to learn in a six-week program."

"Black Culture because there was too much controversy."

"I was annoyed at the lack of organization and assertion shown in the beginning of the Institute. I feel simple things such as dividing into groups could have been done more arbitrarily and efficiently."

"Lab -- complete waste of time better spent doing more of the other work we did."

"I enjoyed all parts. Each was very informative."

"Not any part."

Questions 3 through 8 were really subquestions to Number 2 mentioned above. In the case of the question about the lab, 26 would have preferred a demonstration class. Of this number 20 stated they would have preferred that it be held on campus; 3, that it be held in a public school (s); and 3, with no preference as to its location. There were a few variations among the rest of the answers: for example, 2 out of our 37 considered lab unimportant. One wanted a non-demonstration class on campus; 2, a demonstration class in a public school, and the like.

Here were some comments on this question:

"I think the lab served the purpose of a demonstration class, that is, if everybody had done what they were supposed to. If a demonstration was necessary we could have brought the children out every day of the last week, so that each group could have demonstrated what they had been doing."

"Yes. I would have preferred that the demonstration class held on campus. In this way we would have had more time to observe, build a rapport with the children and teach them. For it to have been very meaningful, I think that a lab should have been held every day (maybe excluding Friday). A lab for this institute is most important. This is to put into practice what has been learned in the classes."

"No. But if so - in an elem. school."

"I would have preferred a demonstration class held on campus to meet as infrequently as possible because I don't think the lab is valuable."

"The lab was a good idea, but it should have been set up on the campus instead of in the public schools."

"I liked the lab as it was, I think maybe one demonstration class would have been Okay, but basically the lab I feel was successful just as it was in the individual schools. I think that in general the lab was invaluable for this type of institute, because it gave us the opportunity to try our ideas out on a small group of children before presenting them to our classes."

"A demonstration class would have been best - held in an elementary school - at least once a week."

Most participants suggested the lab be held 3 times a week; a few others, twice a week.

Question 4 really was unnecessary, as it called for largely the same information that was brought out by questions 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8. However, it did bring to our attention the need for a primary school

teacher on our staff (suggested by 5 participants). Among the other most frequent replanned parts were no tests (4), more visiting lecturers (4), and more time to develop materials on institute time (3). Five participants stated they would replan it pretty much the same way it was actually planned.

With regard to the ratio of Black to White participants 26 participants would have preferred a 1:1 ratio, whereas only 6 would have retained our present ratio of 3:1. The rest either were indifferent or suggested slightly different ratios.

Twenty-one participants liked a six-week institute, some saying this was sufficient time, others mentioning the need for a vacation. Eleven argued in favor of an 8-week institute. The rest wanted other durations (4 weeks, 9 weeks, 1 or 2 semesters.)

Thirty-six of the 37 participants were in favor of a follow-up institute for our original participants. One was opposed to such.

We had not made arrangements for a follow-up as such. However, we found that our better teachers - many of whom were in semi-administrative positions locally - and some of the teachers who had worked with them in their lab groups developed a keen esprit de corps and talked of working together to implement our methodology, materials, and ideas more widely in the Hillsborough County Schools. In the case of several of the local schools there were 2 or 3 teachers from each who attended our institute, so these schools are most likely to feel the impact of our work most immediately. Various teachers also pointed out that they could very easily invite teachers from other local schools who were participants to speak with their school's staff and to run small in-service training programs for their teachers. We believe we can truly rely upon the upper 25% to implement this new curricula and methodology in the Tampa public schools. Then, too, as other parts of the nation begin to operate similar institutes, workshops, and in-service training programs, this group of most promising teachers will be able to attend and acquire additional training to bring back to the Tampa schools and can share with others in those programs across the country their experiences gained from our institute and from their own subsequent classroom implementation.

The role of school administrators as institute participants was an issue that almost divided the class in half. Twenty-one of our own participants favored the inclusion of more administrators, arguing that for any program to go over in the schools it needs administrative support. Yet 15 opposed the inclusion of administrators (only one had no opinion). Those who did so displayed a great distrust for administrative personnel in general.

Here are some of the answers to this question:

"Yes. These are the people that will have to buy the program on a wide scale. With individual teachers doing their thing or slipping teaching Black Culture, it doesn't have the meaning that it would if it was open. With administrators here ideas from the institute could be shared with a whole school or system. I will have to do this when I go back. Tell the whole school (teachers & adm.), demonstrate and share ideas."

"A larger percentage of school administrators would have been better because they are the ones who could reach more people. Screening of participants wasn't good at all. There were people in the group who showed no interest at all. They will take nothing away with them, except money."

"Yes a larger percentage for them to be aware of what problems both would encounter."

"No - school administrators do not actively participate in the classroom and usually do not set up good programs."

"I think this would have helped since the administrators seem to be our problem."

"No - most school administrators posses (sic) very negative ideas toward anything other than their field of study."

"No! Because thus far I have not encountered any worthwhile administrators. As I know them they have been watered down and out-dated even though they were young in years."

"A couple of Black principals, and a couple of White Principal (sic) may have been okay. In this way they would have been able to carry the ideas expressed in the Institute back to Principal's meetings. On the other hand too many administrators may tend to hamper full teacher participation due to an element of fear."

"I definitely would have preferred to see a larger percentage of school administrators because, this is how the program is really sold in the county school system."

Perhaps most significant was the question: "In terms of the new knowledge that you acquired this summer which of it is most valuable to your work?" (Here many participants listed several components each.) Seventeen stated all of the institute's work. Ten said Black Culture. Four said grammar. Three said Black dialects and their structure. Three said the class materials. Three said the phonological transcriptions. Two said dealing with children in teaching Standard English. One said methodology. One said Professor Roger Abrahams' lecture. Each participant listed that she had learned something valuable from among this inventory.

Here were some of the individual answers to this one:

"I learned how not to treat children. I learned how to be more patient with children, how not to push over on children what I believe, and that is that. I must truly say that I have learned a lot from this work shop."

"As a whole I plan to use all of the things I learned in class with children I work with next year and years to come."

"All of it."

"I will listen a little more to the speech patterns of children."

"All is most valuable."

"I guess I can say all of it."

"The knowledge most valuable to my work will be that of Black dialects and Black Culture. I can better understand the two dialects and use them interchangeably. I will be able to use the materials for language improvement."

"The knowledge acquired this summer that is most valuable to my work is the "Black component." Just knowing of its awareness will help me in teaching black pride to my children."

"The most valuable knowledge acquire (sic) for me, would be the Dialect of Negro children."

"The knowledge that I have comprehended or acquired this summer will help me in all respect (sic). One, it has made me aware that more Black culture should be taught and Two, to listen for the many ways in which children say things."

"All of it! However, I had phonetics, so I can not (sic) honestly say it was valuable."

"Believe it or not the trees and transcription are the most important."

"I would say that all of the knowledge I acquired this summer was most valuable. I will be using the materials that were developed so I imagine the development of material is most valuable."

"Although aware of the problem, teachers (most) did not know how to attack the teaching of Media English to children of different dialects. The Guest Speaker, who used the tapes pointed out one method that could be used. Other methods that were developed by the class are also valuable."

1. "Awareness and recognition of dialectual (sic) differences and how to keep an open ear for them.
2. "Recognition and distinction between a speech problem and a dialect difference.
3. "Background information concerning black culture for my own personal use. Parts could be implemented in teaching."

"All equally distributed. There is something to be gained or learned from each experience."

"Grammar as it relates to black dialect - Black culture."

1. "A wider knowledge of Black Heritage.
2. "A wider knowledge of phonetics.
3. "An awareness of the difference in black dialect and Media English.
"I feel that No. 3 is most important because even though I knew the difference existed, I sort of took it for granted. Now I will be aware of the differences and be more corrective."

III. Conclusions

While the development of "sensitivity" to the feelings and aspirations of Blacks and Whites was one of our institutes accomplishments, it was far more than a conglomeration of sensitivity courses. In our view and in that of our participants as expressed in their answers to our questionnaire, we were able to make our participants aware of some of the specific differences between "Standard English" (Media English, General American English, Racially Undifferentiated Speech, or whatever other name is used to refer to the general literacy standard) and Black dialects. We were able to get them to see that, as we now know, the form a particular language or dialect takes setting it off from others has absolutely nothing to do with the inherent intelligence of the speaker. We were able to teach them some of the methodology necessary for teaching the literacy standard as a second dialect, although methodology was probably our weakest component due in no small measure to our problems with the language laboratory. We were able to show our participants a proper role for the particular dialect that any child speaks. Our teachers will now encourage children to talk in class - in whatever way they are most able to express themselves - and thereby to develop their individual verbal skills. But at the same time the teachers will show the children how to express their ideas also in Standard English. This will undoubtedly be an important aid in the long run in eliminating illiteracy, a major handicap among the poor. Our Black participants will be more willing to use their dialect in class wherever necessary, and our White teachers will be more able to understand their children's speech. Our teachers will be better prepared to listen more objectively to each child's language patterns for diagnostic purposes. Whereas at present many White teachers are referring Black children to speech therapists, labeled as having a speech impediment, our own group will be in a very good position to determine whether it is a dialectal

difference or a speech pathological condition. In fact, one of our most promising participants, a speech therapist, directs the Speech Specialists in the Hillsborough County System and has already initiated an in-service training program for them in conjunction with the Model Cities Program as operated in Tampa.

Our teachers - Black and White - now have a far keener understanding of the development of Black society in a predominantly Anglo America. Our Blacks will teach with a greater understanding and pride, our Whites with a greater compassion and less prejudice. We showed our teachers model materials and helped them each to develop their own materials, all of which they will take back to their classrooms for implementation and modification.

When the attitudinal changes brought about by a linguistic view of language and dialect are considered, it becomes clear that a major prerequisite for the success of a training program in the areas of our institute is the support of the local community and of the various educational institutions involved. In our case we were to receive favorable publicity in the press of Tampa and nearby communities. The Hillsborough County Public School system was to make available to us whatever facilities we asked for. Where difficulties arose, they were due to the size of the administration involved and the corresponding difficulties in transmitting information. It was probably a very good thing for us to operate our Tampa experiment with a small staff and a small training program. As we learned what was useful and effective and what was not, we gained experience that may be of value to future training programs in English as a second dialect.

Although the ideal is rarely attained, it should nevertheless serve as a guide in planning and evaluation. In an ideal institute the lab component would be well organized and integrated into the content components of that program. It would serve as a model and as a proving ground for institute materials and methodology. An ideal institute would staff its program with experts in all the fields represented: Black history and institutions, teaching English as a second language/dialect, the structure of Negro dialects, American dialectology, sociolinguistics, and classroom methodology. Even though we have fallen short of the ideal, we have made major accomplishments. Perhaps the greatest realization of how much we really had accomplished came to me the next-to-last day of our program. Two teachers who were attending a regular education class on campus asked me to speak to that class about the methods of our institute. I was given 30 minutes to discuss such. In the class there were about 20 teachers or so, all white. About half of them had been assigned to teach in a predominantly Negro school in the Tampa area this fall - for the very first time. These teachers were truly scared, since they did not know anything about teaching Black youngsters. About halfway through my talk I stopped to field some questions.

One of the teachers wanted to know if since whites now knew "so much about Black culture," were Blacks "now studying about White culture?" I could only reply that they have been learning about White culture all their lives. This was a typical question from these teachers, and no doubt it represented the attitudes and teaching skills they will take into Black schools. But I think I became most keenly aware of the progress our participants made when one of the teachers in this non-institute class interrupted my 30-minutes talk on dialects to ask: "Okay. So it's all right for a Black kid to say in class: 'De floo' done been clean.' But shouldn't you <u>still</u> jump all over him for saying it like that?